

Can.
Pam.

Forest protection and
the tariff on lumber.

FOREST PROTECTION

— AND THE —

TARIFF ON LUMBER.

SPIRIT OF THE PRESS.

NEW YORK.

1883.

The attention of the public is invited to the consideration of these pages, in the hope that a fuller discussion and better understanding of the importance of our forests will lead to wise measures for Forest Preservation.

New York City, January, 1888.

I

in
pr
in
of
in
sa
fi
an
th
T
le
n
S
g
d
s

PUBLIC OPINION
ON
FOREST PROTECTION
AND THE
LUMBER TARIFF.

(From the Message of President Arthur.)

The condition of the forests of the country, and the wasteful manner in which their destruction is taking place, give cause for serious apprehension. Their action in protecting the earth's surface, in modifying the extremes of climate, and in regulating and sustaining the flow of springs and streams, is now well understood, and their importance in relation to the growth and prosperity of the country cannot be safely disregarded. They are fast disappearing before destructive fires and the legitimate requirements of our increasing population, and their total extinction cannot be long delayed unless better methods than now prevail shall be adopted for their protection and cultivation. The attention of Congress is invited to the necessity of additional legislation to secure the preservation of the valuable forests still remaining on the public domain, especially in the extreme Western States and Territories, where the necessity for their preservation is greater than in less mountainous regions, and where the prevailing dryness of the climate renders their restoration, if they are once destroyed, well-nigh impossible.

(From Prof. Charles S. Sargent, Director of the Arnold Arboretum, Harvard University and Special Agent in Charge of Forestry Statistics in the U. S. Census.—North American Review.)

THE PROTECTION OF FORESTS.

Forest preservation, as a national question, must soon occupy public attention. The problem involved is one of grave import, and its solution is not easy and cannot be immediate. The part taken by the forest in the economy of nature, and its relations to the wants of man, are complex, and the American people are still ignorant, not only of what a forest is, but of the actual condition of their own forests, and of the dangers which threaten them. The future prosperity and development of the country, however, are so largely dependent upon the preservation of the forest that these lessons will in time be learned, although, judging from the experience of other countries, they will be learned only at the cost of calamities which a better understanding of the subject might perhaps have averted.

* * * * *

Fatal inroads have already been made into the great pine forest of the North Atlantic region. Its wealth has been lavished with an unsparing hand; it has been wantonly and stupidly cut, as if its resources were endless; what has not been sacrificed to the axe has been allowed to perish by fire. The pine of New England and New York has already disappeared. Pennsylvania is nearly stripped of her pine, which only a few years ago appeared inexhaustible. The great northwestern pine States, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, can show only a few scattered remnants of the noble forests to which they owe their greatest prosperity, and which not even self-interest has saved from needless destruction.

* * * * *

The belt of red-wood forest along the California coast has already suffered severely at the hands of the lumberman, and many of its finest and most accessible trees have already been removed. A large amount of this valuable timber is still standing—less, however, than has generally been supposed; and at the present rate of consumption the commercial importance of this forest will have disappeared at the end of a few years more.

* * * * *

In Professor Sargent's paper, read before the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture, the following important statement respecting the white pine is made:

The entire supply (white pine) growing in the United States and ready for the axe, does not to-day greatly, if at all, exceed 80,000,000,000 feet, and this estimate includes the small and inferior trees, which a few years ago, would not have been considered worth counting. The annual production of this lumber, is not far from 10,000,000,000 feet, and the demand is constantly and rapidly increasing.

The publication of these facts a few months ago has greatly increased, and in some cases more than doubled, the value of pine lands; and it does not require any particular powers of foresight to be able to predict that the price must advance to still higher figures. Enough is now known to permit the positive statement that no great unexplored body of this pine remains; and that with the exception of the narrow red-wood belt of the California coast, no North American forest can yield in quantity any substitute for it.

(The New York Times, Dec. 30, 1882.)

The Tariff Commission, for some reason which they have not thought fit as yet to explain, made no change in the lumber schedule. They left the tax on sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, white-wood, sycamore, and bass-wood as they found it, \$1 per thousand feet, board measure. They also left the duty on all other articles of sawed lumber at \$2 per thousand feet, board measure. As shown by a correspondent in another column, the amount of sawed lumber imported in 1882 was about 610,000,000 feet, of which less than 7 per cent., or 40,000,000 feet, consisted of the kinds above enumerated, *i. e.*, of hemlock, white wood, sycamore, and bass-wood, while the remainder consisted almost altogether of white pine and spruce. The duty on the 40,000,000 feet was \$1 per thousand feet, an average of about 12 per cent.; the duty on the "other lumber" was \$2 per thousand, or an average of nearly 18 per cent. * * * * White pine and spruce, though more costly than hemlock, are still cheap woods. They are the raw material of the greater part of the building trade. They furnish the floorings, the doors and window-sashes, the stair-ways, the outer approaches, the outer covering of the great mass of the houses of wood erected all over the country. They

enter in the same way into the construction of all outbuildings, barns, sheds, stables, of the shops, stores, and work-buildings of the country and smaller towns and villages. They are used extensively in the construction of vessels, especially for inland and river navigation, and for vehicles of transportation. They are the material of the tables, bedsteads, and furniture of the laboring classes and of those in moderate circumstances. They are thus an indispensable element in the cost of living, of agricultural and other labor, of trade and transportation. The tax on them is paid by the consumer, for the competition at home is usually sufficiently limited to secure that result, and it is levied exclusively for the benefit of the pine and spruce lumbermen.

At the same moment that this is being done, the Government, which imposes this arbitrary tax, is engaged in costly researches and experiments to check the wanton waste of precisely these materials, to induce the lumbermen to adopt more intelligent and economical methods, and to promote the growth of trees, because the fact is established beyond all question that the consumption is far outrunning the natural supply. This is so true that, as our correspondant points out, Prof. Sargent, in charge of the census statistics for this interest, warns the country that the total estimated supply in the United States cannot at the present rate of consumption last more than eight years. In other words, to enable the lumbermen to obtain a higher price for woods which they are rapidly exhausting, we tax imported woods which in eight years will be our sole dependence for one of the most important necessary articles in use. This is protection run mad. It is one of many instances in which Congress, under the pretense of protecting American labor, imposes a tax on the livelihood of American laborers. Nothing can be plainer than that, instead of compelling our people, by an import duty on foreign lumber, to use more of our limited and fast disappearing supply, we should admit such lumber free of duty.

* * * * *

(*The New York World, New York, December 30.*)

Professor Sargent, of Harvard, showed in his recent article on our forests, in the *North American Review*, the necessity of taking some immediate steps for their preservation. As a first step, it is evident that the duty on Canadian lumber ought to have been removed. We impose a tax of \$2 per 1,000 feet on lumber entering the United States

from Canada, and this duty, of course, instead of protecting the forests, serves as a bounty for the rapid destruction of them. It takes \$2 out of the pocket of every man who buys 1,000 feet of lumber and hands it over to the lumber manufacturers of Chicago and the Northwest whom and whom only it does protect. These lumbermen, as they very clearly showed when they went before the Tariff Commission to demand still more protection and encouragement in cutting down such of the pine forests as still remain, are as greedy and short-sighted a class of leeches as even our ridiculous tariff has developed. They will not easily let go their hold, but they are not so numerous or so powerful as to offer an effective resistance to the friends of tariff reform in Congress, if these will work together. The public mischief the lumbermen do is so patent and so serious that there should be no difficulty in getting this special abomination removed from the tariff during the present session of Congress.

(The Sun, New York, December 31, 1882.)

THE TARIFF ON LUMBER.

The Tariff Commission does not recommend any change of importance in the present schedule of duties upon imported lumber. Under the law there is a duty of one dollar per thousand feet upon hemlock, whitewood, sycamore, and basswood lumber, and two dollars upon all other varieties of sawed lumber entering the United States. No sawed lumber is imported into the United States except from Canada, so that this law operates only so far as Canada is concerned. Canada cannot send us sycamore or white wood, for the reason that she has none to send; and we do not require Canadian hemlock or basswood. It is not apparent why those words are mentioned at all, except for the purpose of disguising the real meaning of the law, which was intended to check or prevent the introduction of Canadian white pine and spruce into our markets; and this is done for the benefit of individuals manufacturing a similar class of lumber in the United States.

Pine and spruce are articles of prime necessity; they enter into the construction of all our buildings, and our forests afford no substitute for these woods. It is, moreover, now well known that the supply of white pine and spruce in the United States has been greatly reduced, and that the speedy and entire extinction of our forests of these trees can be safely predicted.

Public attention has been called to the necessity for forest protection; the subject has been widely discussed, and its importance is known. Instead of husbanding our own forest resources, however, and allowing our neighbors across the boundary to cut their forests for our benefit, we continue to impose the duty of two dollars a thousand feet on all pine and spruce entering the United States; that is, we take that amount from the pocket of every person using one thousand feet of these prime necessities of life and pay it to the lumbermen as a bounty to induce them, not to protect our forests, but to destroy them with quite unnecessary rapidity and waste.

The arguments which have been used, and which will be brought forward again by the representatives of the lumber industry of the Northwest—for the exclusion of Canadian lumber is urged in no other part of the country—do not interest the general public. The people want a constant and reasonably cheap supply of lumber; they want to know that the forests of the country are not unnecessarily destroyed; but they are indifferent whether a local body of selfish manufacturers, already enormously rich, became still richer at the expense of the general prosperity of the country.

The present Congress will certainly neglect one of its most important duties if it fails to provide means for the better protection of the forests of the country. The first step in this direction which will be followed by immediate and tangible results is to place sawed, hewn, and square timber upon the free list.

We urge the consideration of this subject upon the Committee of Ways and Means.

(*The Evening Post, New York, January 2, 1883.*)

THE TARIFF ON LUMBER.

There is the best statistical authority for the statement that, if the present rate of consumption of lumber continues, the entire supply of white pine growing in the United States will be exhausted in eight years. As our population increases, our industries expand, and our settlements spread, it is certain that the consumption of lumber of all kinds will not only not decrease, but grow considerably larger. It is no less certain, therefore, that if the quantity of white pine consumed be entirely drawn from our home supply, or, at least, in the same proportion as at present, that home supply will be exhausted in less than

eight years, especially as a vast deal of wanton destruction of trees by improvident lumbermen and by fires goes along with the regular consumption in a business way. What is true of the white pine is more or less true of every other kind of timber. There is not the least particle of exaggeration in the prediction that, if we continue to draw on our timber resources at the present rate, the people of the United States will, in less than twenty years, not only depend for the necessary supply of lumber to cover their current wants entirely upon foreign countries, but our country will be almost completely stripped of its forests. What the consequences of such a condition are every well-informed person knows; dried-up springs; destructive floods at one season of the year, dry river-beds at another; parched fields; once fertile plains turned into deserts. We can see the lesson illustrated in Spain and in the ruined countries of Asia. This will be our inevitable fate unless the suicidal course we are now pursuing be stopped.

What are we doing? We are levying a tariff duty not only on articles manufactured out of wood, such as furniture and wheel hubs, and staves and the like, but on sawed boards and hewn timber and other things that may properly be called raw material. What is the object of this tariff duty? Scarcely to raise revenue, for the sum of money flowing into the Treasury from this source is comparatively small, the duty being high enough to prevent large importations. The object is, by impeding foreign competition, to enable lumbermen to cut and saw timber at a tempting profit; to protect and encourage, not the manufacturing of house furniture and cabinet ware, and wagon boxes and barrel staves—for those branches of industry would be encouraged most by cheapening, not by increasing the price of the raw material—but to protect and encourage the cutting and sawing up of trees, and thus the rapid destruction of the forests within our own boundaries. We prevent the British possessions north of us from furnishing from their abundance the raw material to our manufactories, thus obliging our neighbors to keep their forests comparatively intact, while we insist upon sweeping away our own. In other words, we pay to the lumbermen a premium for the devastation of our country.

These facts are so plain and patent, and the disastrous consequences are so obvious, that it would seem the mere statement of them must convince every sane man of the imperative and immediate necessity of changing our policy. It is not a matter that will brook delay from year to year, for if we persist in our present course, our middle-aged

men will surely see the time when the case is past remedy. We should rather pay a bounty to every importer of sawed boards and hewn timber than impose a duty upon those articles. Only the Tariff Commission did not see the pressing need. It thought that this was too flourishing an industry to be disturbed by the withdrawal of encouraging protection. The premium on the devastation of the country is therefore sustained. But may we not at least hope that some men may be found in Congress to recognize and urge upon their colleagues the necessity of immediate and sweeping action? The Committee of Ways and Means recommends only a partial and insignificant reduction of the duty. It is evident that in this case nothing will do short of placing the raw material, such as sawed boards, hewn and squared timber, etc., on the free list. Of course, there will be the usual screech against this indispensable measure of protection on the part of the lumbering interest. But can the American people afford to sacrifice an essential condition of the future prosperity of the country to the destructive greed of a few lumbermen?

(And again, January 6, 1883.)

Let us now see what they did with regard to those kinds of timber and lumber which can be imported for the benefit of the United States. Pine and spruce lumber to the amount of 570,000,000 feet, in round numbers, was imported into the United States during the last fiscal year. The Government received less than \$1,200,000 in duties upon this lumber.

Pine and spruce lumber to the amount of 11,000,000,000 feet was manufactured in the United States during the past year. The purchasers of this domestic lumber paid a duty of \$22,000,000—not to the Government, but to the manufacturers of lumber; that is, the great sum of \$22,000,000 was taken from the growth and prosperity of the country, and paid to a few manufacturers of lumber. It is not, then, surprising that the manufacturers resist all attempts made to remove this duty. Pine and spruce lumber are necessities of our civilization, but the reduction in price which would follow the removal of the duty would probably not greatly stimulate their consumption. Certainly, looking at the subject in the light of the necessity of forest preservation, the damage done to the forest by increased consumption would be more than offset by the effect which the admission of Canadian lumber would have in sparing our own forests.

The removal of this duty is something more than a question of free trade or protection. Its importance must not be measured by the advantages of cheap or dear lumber for the consumer, important as this question is, nor by its effect upon the manufacturer. It means protection or destruction of the forests, and the destruction of the forests means a great national calamity.

This matter cannot be postponed ; our forests, as has been shown, are rapidly swept away by the drains now made upon them. They must be relieved, and their only possible relief is found in Canada. The \$22,000,000 which the tariff takes from the pockets of the consumers of lumber is unimportant in comparison with the indirect damage this tariff causes to the country by hastening the destruction of the forests. We must look this matter clearly in the face ; we must not deliberately allow our forests to be destroyed, and entail upon ourselves and our children all the evils which their destruction will bring, merely to make a few lumbermen rich. On this one point tariff reformers and protectionists can well meet on the common ground of public necessity. The future prosperity of the country is at stake !

(*The Evening Post.*)

PROTECT THE FORESTS.

It is to be hoped that our protectionist friends will, at their meeting to-night, say something on the subject of forest protection. This is one of which all can unite in urging upon Congress the immediate necessity. As the Metropolitan Industrial League, a truly protectionist organization, most pertinently says, "It seems so unnatural that we should consume ourselves [meaning our forests] first, and then depend upon the chance generosity of others, that the free admission of timber is recommended."

The white pine, that has in the past furnished nearly the whole of our timber supplies, and is now furnishing about one-half (according to Professor Sargent), will cease to exist if the present destruction of it is kept up for eight years longer.

Our own State of New York, which thirty years ago supplied one-half of the entire production of the United States, is now dependent wholly for its supply of this wood on Canada and the lower peninsula of Michigan. The latter has so far exhausted its supply of this

timber that it is claimed from investigation that four years more, at the present rate of cutting, will exhaust the whole stock.

Whatever difference may exist as to the propriety of protecting other interests, there can be none patriotically urged against the protection of the remnant of our pine forests. While taking care of favored industries, the advocates of high tariff duties should aid the people at least in securing this crumb of beneficent protection for so important a general interest, by recommending the striking off of the duty on lumber and all kindred duties which encourage the devastation of the country.

(Kansas City Times, January 3, 1883.)

THE TARIFF ON LUMBER.

No change will be made in the tariff on lumber. The duty is \$2 per 1,000 on pine and \$1 on hemlock, basswood or lin, as it is called here, and other soft woods. Lumber is used by every farmer who must build himself a house or fence his farm. Why should it be taxed? No country brings lumber here but Canada. The pine timber there is practically inexhaustible, while, it is said, the pineries in Michigan and Minnesota, and also in the eastern states, are rapidly becoming exhausted. Why not, when the new farms are being settled up and the people poor, let them get lumber as cheap as possible? Soon our pineries will be used up and then we will be dependent altogether on a foreign supply.

Great quantities of saw logs were cut in Canada and brought to the United States to be cut into lumber, but when the tariff was put on Canadian lumber that government retaliated by putting an export duty on saw logs, so that the business of importing logs was killed. The price of lumber here went up two dollars per thousand as soon as the tariff went into effect, so the Canadians got the old price for their lumber, and the people here, who are trying to make the country, are absolutely robbed of that amount on each 1,000 feet of pine lumber they buy. The United States treasury don't want the money. It only enhances the price of lumber to a business the most lucrative and profitable in the country, and certainly oppresses the farmer in getting comfortable buildings. Of all senseless tariff regulations this is the most senseless.

Lumber is an article no farmer can do without. The first settlers in any new locality have to live in any kind of habitation they can

get—
nurtu
ren u
some
found
blue
mock
board
even
modi
soone
The
that
of lu
low t
this,

Th
pear
reten
a fair
whic
their
even
think
enter
able,
Wha
have
lumb
of th
reall
Th
Nort
in ne

get—sod houses, dug-outs, tents, every kind of substitute. Tenderly nurtured women, men who have been brought up in fine homes, children upon whom the winds of heaven have never blown roughly, upon some reverse of fortune have, with breaking hearts and weeping eyes, found themselves upon the bare prairie with scarcely a shelter but the blue arch of heaven, with the wild winds more pitiful than the pitiless mockery of a free government at Washington. Why tax the rough boards they must have, not to make a comfortable home, but to save even their lives? Why, by a high tariff, stimulate the price of a commodity that must soon be gone, and thus cause our pineries to be sooner exhausted? To keep the money in the country, do you say? The \$2 per thousand extra would never leave the poor man's pocket that now goes to enrich a few lumber rings who now control the price of lumber all over these United States, and not a foot can be sold below the price they name. The tariff makes it possible for them to do this, and it should be abolished.

(The Nation, New York, January 4, 1883.)

THE TARIFF ON LUMBER.

The representatives of the Chicago lumber manufacturers who appeared last autumn before the Tariff Commission and advocated the retention of the tariff on lumber, were endowed, it is to be hoped, with a fair sense of humor, else they must lose much of the enjoyment to which they are entitled in contemplating the readiness with which their bait was swallowed by the commission. The joke is excellent, even if the public at large cannot quite appreciate it. The lumbermen think that the present duty of \$2 per 1,000 feet imposed upon lumber entering the United States from the Dominion of Canada is reasonable, and the Tariff Commission concurs with them in this view. What are the facts in the case which the Tariff Commission should have taken into consideration in discussing this duty upon Canadian lumber? We are now, since the publication of the Forestry Bulletins of the Census, for the first time in a position to examine the subject really intelligently.

The duty was placed upon Canadian lumber in the interest of the Northwestern lumbermen. It benefited no other class, and was desired in no other section. The lumbermen of the Northwest argued that

their pine forests were inexhaustible—able to supply indefinitely all the demands the country could ever make upon them: and that beyond the boundary these forests extended indefinitely, containing such a body of lumber that the human mind could not even grasp its immensity. They could manufacture all the lumber the country could ever need. But if the Canadians, with their greater facilities for manufacturing, their lower wages and better timber, should be admitted to competition, the home manufactories must perish. By exaggerating the extent of the pine forests of the United States, they were able to purchase pine lands at a nominal price. By maintaining the duty upon Canadian lumber, they were enabled to manufacture lumber at a large profit. The plan was well conceived and successful; but unfortunately the census brought some disagreeable facts to light. It showed that in 1880, even, the pine forests of the country had already severely suffered, and that they were not only not inexhaustible, but in reality almost exhausted. It showed that the production of white-pine lumber had increased and was increasing with dangerous rapidity, and that the complete extinction of Chicago as a great lumber-distributing point could be foretold with entire certainty. The publication of these facts was followed by the natural results: the price of pine land doubled in a few months, and in some cases even quadrupled. But the lumbermen still persevered a bold front. They denounced the census, and set to work to discover undiscoverable pine.

Their first venture was in Tennessee; and on the western slopes of the Allegheny mountains and the Cumberland Plateau, where the broad-leaved forest of the Mississippi basin culminates in all its richness and beauty, their organs discovered a great body of white pine, which contained more lumber than Michigan could boast upon the day of its discovery. The choice of locality had been badly made; East Tennessee was too well known, and had to be abandoned. Their next attempt was made in the North. A traveler and woodsman of tremendous experience and intelligence rushed into Chicago, breathless with excitement. He had discovered, on a little stream flowing from the north into the Georgian Bay, a body of the most magnificent white pine the eye of man had ever beheld. It contained hundreds or thousands of billion feet of lumber—enough to supply the United States and Canada for at least a century. Unhappily, it was shown that the stream in question was only about thirty miles in length, that the valley which it watered was situated near the extreme northern edge of the pine forest, and that the few pine trees which grew along its banks

among the hardier denseness of the great sub-arctic forests of the north, were scattered, small, and utterly worthless for commercial purposes.

All this had occurred before the meeting of the Tariff Commission in Chicago. The lumbermen, finding that they could no longer secure the raw material at a nominal price, were more anxious than ever to maintain the duty on Canadian lumber, and so keep up the price of the manufactured article. The vast resources of the Canadian forests, and the dangers which threatened the lumber manufactories of the United States from Canadian competition, were still held up as sufficient reasons for maintaining the duty. It is still impossible to speak with great precision of the Canadian forests. Their extent, but not their productive capacity, is known. They are composed, east of the Rocky Mountains, of pine and fir, and west of the Rocky Mountains largely of fir. The number of broad-leaved trees which extend north of the boundary of the United States is comparatively small, and none of them attain either the size or quality of the same species further south. The competition, then, which we have to fear from Canadian lumber is in pine and spruce; that is, in comparatively cheap woods, which enter into the general construction of all buildings, and which are among the prime necessities of civilized life. But if the productive capacity of Canadian pine forests is less known than that of our own, reliable information is not entirely wanting in regard to them. Intelligent estimates of the amount of pine standing in Canada have been made, and, although differing considerably in amount, they are not without value, as it appears that the last estimates made differ from the earlier ones principally because they include small trees, which a few years ago were entirely disregarded. It is safe to assume, in any case, that the existing Canadian pine forests will not yield more than 40 to 50,000,000,000 feet of merchantable pine. The production of white-pine lumber in the United States is now not far from 10,000,000,000 feet annually; so that, in order to protect the Chicago lumbermen from competition with a body of pine which does not exceed four or five years' supply for this country, we impose a tax of \$2 upon every 1,000 feet of white pine, spruce, or Oregon fir used in the United States. The manufacturers of lumber grow rich; the consumers and the forests suffer.

The country is not without words of warning in regard to the dangers which threaten the forests; they have been spoken far and wide. In the meantime we continue to take \$2 from the pocket of every man using a thousand feet of pine or spruce lumber, and hand

it over to the manufacturers as a bounty to induce them to destroy the forests more rapidly. It is natural, then, that the manufacturers resist any attempt to have this duty removed. They will make a still more determined fight to prevent it. They are bold, rich, and united. They are actuated by a single purpose—to convert the greatest amount of forest into the largest amount of money in the shortest possible time. Their organization is perfect. They control Legislatures and elect members of Congress; they own Governors and Senators. They know what they want and they mean to have it any cost, and without regard to the future prosperity of the country. It will take something stronger than the Tariff Commission to make them let go their grip upon the people. We repeat, the tariff duty on lumber is a premium on the devastation of the country, and should be repealed without delay.

(The Weekly Witness, New York, January 4th, 1883.)

TIMBER AND THE TARIFF.

Of all the features of the present tariff it would be difficult to find one so utterly stupid and blind to self-interest as that regarding lumber. As every one knows, our timber supply is being used up with alarming rapidity. Yet we put a premium upon the destruction of our forests by obstructing the importation of lumber from Canada, and preserve the wealth of our Northern neighbors by discouraging them from cutting their timber for our benefit.

The protective system as applied to manufacturing industry, has many plausible arguments in its favor. It is claimed for it that it makes the country self-dependent in case of war, and that is certainly a great advantage. It is claimed that this system makes wages high. It is claimed that protection makes things cheaper in the long run by inducing such competition in the favored industries as to bring down prices. There are many plausible arguments such as the foregoing, in favor of protection to manufacturing industries; and however fallacious these may be proved to be, it is not to be wondered at that they find credence in many honest but unreflecting minds.

There is likewise something to be said in favor of duties even upon many raw materials produced in this country.

But how is it in the case of timber? Our forest resources are not only not inexhaustible, but a very few years will see the end of them.

to destroy
manufacturers
make a still
and united.
est amount
est possible
atures and
tors. They
nd without
something
their grip
a premium
ed without

33.)

ult to find
rding lum-
ed up with
ruction of
m Canada,
discouraging

dustry, has
it that it
s certainly
tes wages
n the long
s to bring
s the fore-
and how-
ndered at
ds.

even upon

es are not
d of them.

Wood is a raw material than which there is none of more general and imperative need. Frame houses are built of it. Brick and stone houses require it for floorings, doors, window-sashes, roofs, etc. It enters into the construction of barns, stables, sheds, and outbuildings of all kinds. It is the material for tables, bedsteads, and other furniture. Steamboats and wagons are made of it, and it is used in immense quantities for railroad ties. Indeed it would be hardly possible to overestimate the value of wood, and the importance of ensuring an abundant supply. And yet what has been our policy in this matter? With one hand the government offers timber claims and various bonuses to induce farmers to plant forests which will not be available till some distant future day; while with the other hand it offers a premium to lumbermen to cut away the forests we have, which have been generations in attaining their present size. Canada has vast forests which we might have drawn upon, under free trade—that is, if the Canadians had been foolish enough to cut them as recklessly as we have cut ours. On the contrary we have deliberately obstructed the importation of Canadian lumber, and not only compelled our people to pay a higher price than otherwise for this article of prime necessity, but destroyed in the most prodigal fashion a heritage which it is hardly possible in the lifetime of this generation to restore. All this has been done for the benefit of a few wealthy lumbermen, who may be depended upon to make consumers pay the highest possible price, and who care more for immediate profit to themselves than for the future timber resources of the country. If there is any possible way of defending such protection as that, we would like to know it.

(*The Commercial Gazette, Cincinnati, January 5, 1883.*)

BOUNTIES TO DESTROY THE FORESTS.

Scientific people say that forests temper the extremes of climate, equalize the rainfall, equalize the flow of streams, and so preserve fertility, and increase comfort. They deplore the rapid cutting down of our forests, and patriotic men have formed associations to promote the planting of woods, to counteract this tendency to drouth and barrenness. The object seems highly patriotic. But while we are thus trying to propagate forestry by individual and associated voluntary

effort, are we not, as a whole, stimulating the cutting of our forest by an extraordinary Government bounty? The duties laid on imported timber and lumber are a direct bounty paid by the people for mowing down the forests of our country.

As well send out an army of incendiaries, and then expect to equalize the moisture by following with a hand-squirt, as trying to counteract the effects of this bounty in cutting down the forests, by planting trees. We are even more absurd than this; for the Government gives the public lands as bounties to those who plant them with trees, while it pays this bounty for cutting off the natural forests. The duty on timber is twenty-five per cent. on "hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars, and in building wharves," and \$1 a hundred cubic feet on "squared or sided, not especially enumerated;" on sawed boards, deal, and other sawed lumber, \$2 per thousand feet, except on hemlock, basswood, sycamore and whitewood which are \$1 per one thousand feet, board measure, and from \$1.50 to \$3.50 for boards in the several degrees of planing and grooving; on hubs for wheels, posts, wagon-blocks, and all sorts of sawed or rough-hewn blocks, twenty per cent.; and so on through staves, shingles, lath, clapboards, and the rest. The Tariff Commission lets these duties stand.

These duties on timber and lumber are not protective in the sense that other protective duties are held; they are destructive. The object of protective duties on foreign products is to extend over our production of those articles; but the lumber duties do not promote the production of lumber in our country; on the contrary, they destroy the supply. It is like paying a bounty to encourage the eating up of seed corn. These destroyed forests are not renewed. Either the land is taken for tillage, or it is left to grow up with poor scrubs. It does not again renew the same timber. This affair can be considered apart from any question of the theory of protection, for these duties are not protective of the home product.

The small revenue from the wood duties proves their effect in stimulating the destruction of our forests. And while these duties are extinguishing the great store of timber which the bounty of Nature gave us, they are a burden upon every industry and upon the living of every workman. Besides, their lack of discrimination makes the farmer pay the same bounty to the domestic lumbermen on the inferior boards for fences, barns and sheds as the importer pays upon clear lumber and the finer qualities. And at the same time mahogany, rosewood and satinwood are admitted free.

Let Congress abolish its land bounties for tree culture, so long as it continues to force the consumers of lumber to pay a bounty to the lumbermen for mowing down our forests. Canada has a vast domain of forest, concerning whose ultimate exhaustion we need not trouble ourselves. Let her furnish our lumber, or a part of it. Let our lumbermen go there and bring it in free of duty, and so do good to every branch of labor. Even if it should diminish the profits of the great monopolists, who have brought up vast tracts of the pine lands, it will be for the general good, and, probably, in the end, will not reduce their gains. The duties on timber and lumber should be wholly abolished, as not protective but destructive.

(The Sun, January 6th, 1883.)

FOREST PROTECTION.

The intelligent discussion which the action of the Committee of Ways and Means in recommending the retention of the duty upon lumber entering the United States has excited in all parts of the country, is gratifying. It indicates that purely economic questions are growing in popular favor, and that everything relating to our forests or forest protection interests the people.

It is probably this interest in forest protection, rather than the desire for cheaper lumber for the consumer, which underlies this discussion.

It is the height of folly, of course, to tax foreign lumber. The duties collected in this way by the Government are insignificant in amount, and every dollar thus collected is taken, over and over again, from the consumer of domestic lumber for the sole benefit of the manufacturers. These have not the excuse of a weak and undeveloped industry which must be built up at the expense of the consumer for the general good of the country.

The manufacturers of lumber are rich, prosperous, and strong. Their methods and facilities for carrying on their business are unsurpassed. No possible competition can deprive them of large profits. If there exists in the United States a single industry which is in the position to flourish without protection, it is the lumber industry.

From purely economic grounds this duty should be removed. It has served to build up dangerous monopolies, and it represses the prosperity of the country. It is evident, however, that the wide interest manifested in this question arises less from the feeling that it is desir-

able to prevent monopoly than from the fact that the removal of this duty is the first, and an indispensable, step toward forest protection. The forest question is becoming one of the popular questions of the day, and everything which relates to the extent and condition of our forests is eagerly read and discussed. It requires no great knowledge of the subject to understand that if Canadian lumber is excluded by the tariff, the drain upon our forests must be greater than if Canadian lumber was allowed to compete on equal terms with the product of our own forests. The people understand this; they understand that the destruction of the forests means something more serious than a dearth of lumber. They apprehend that the removal of the forests will be followed by severe climatic changes; that the rivers of the country will often be changed to torrents or reduced to streamlets; that springs and streams will disappear; that agriculture will perish and manufactures languish. They see these evils hastened by the retention of this protective duty; they ask themselves by what right the prosperity of the country is placed in jeopardy because it is the pleasure of a group of men to grow rich, and because Congress is too ignorant or too indifferent to stop this abuse. No more vital question can come before Congress; perhaps no Congress has ever been called on to decide an economic question of greater moment.

Is there no man who can join the discordant elements of the Protectionists, the Tariff Reformers, and the Free Traders; who can unite Democrats and Republicans on the broad platform of public necessity, to check this destruction of our wasting forests? Such a man will deserve the name of statesman and the gratitude of the country.

(Boston Herald, January 10, 1883.)

LOGIC OF PROTECTION.

In the tariff on lumber another consideration appears. Lumber needs no protection. The price has rapidly advanced under the law of supply and demand. Our forests are disappearing. We need to protect them from destruction.

It would be wisdom to encourage the importation of lumber from Canada to save our own forests. On the contrary, we shut out Canadian lumber by the tariff.

* * * *

And again January 14:

The tariff on lumber is working as badly on the Pacific coast as in the rest of the country. The mills on Puget Sound, which supply a large proportion of the lumber other than redwood used on the coast, are in the control of a combination by which prices are kept up, which bears heavily on the growth of Washington territory and Oregon. There is an abundance of lumber in British Columbia, but it is kept out by the duty of \$2 a thousand. The American forests, which most needs protection, are not protected by this protection policy.

(The Record and Guide, New York, January 13, 1883.)

In his last message, President Arthur made reference to the rapid destruction of the forests throughout the country, and stated that "their total extinction cannot long be delayed, unless better methods than now prevail shall be adopted for their protection and cultivation." Another eminent authority, Professor Sargent, gives it as his opinion that within eight years the whole of the white pine forests will have been subjected to the axe, and that the country will thereafter be dependent for its supply from foreign sources. It will thus be seen that unless Congress interferes to stop the further destruction of these trees the country will within a few years be denuded of a timber which is used more than any other for building, furniture, ship-building, and a variety of other purposes. It is true that forests of pine trees can be recultivated, but as it would take a generation before they would reach maturity and be ready for the market, it is evident that for many years the country would have to obtain its supply from Canadian and other extraneous sources. It is surprising, in view of these facts, that neither the Tariff Commission nor the House Committee of Ways and Means have recommended the abolition of the tariff on timber at a time when this appears to be so necessary. It is true the latter have advised a reduction of twenty-five per cent. on certain articles of lumber; but as the items affected do not yield an annual revenue of more than a few thousand dollars, the question can hardly be said to have been touched on the fringe. The entire annual revenue from imports on all kinds of lumber is only \$1,500,000, a sum which can be easily spared from the Treasury; and now that the necessity for their abolition has been evident, it is to be hoped that Congress will not fail to place them on the free list when they come to deal with the question of tariff reform.

ral of this
protection.
ons of the
ion of our
knowledge
cluded by
f Canadian
product of
stand that
ous than a
the forests
ers of the
streamlets;
will perish
by the re-
at right the
he pleasure
oo ignorant
on can come
d on to de-

of the Pro-
o can unite
e necessity,
a man will
ntry.

Lumber
er the law
Ve need to

lumber from
t out Cana-
* *

(*The New York Daily Commercial Bulletin*, January 13.)

TIMBER AND THE TARIFF.

For some years past there has been a growing interest in the subject of forestry, and through the labors of Forestry Associations the public have been brought to some extent to realize the prodigality in our consumption of timber. The interest has arisen mainly from considerations of climatic and meteoric changes, thought to be induced by the destructions of forest, hurtful both to the public health and to the agricultural interests of the country. It has been sought to remedy the evil by inciting the landowner to plant trees, and to endeavor thus, for the benefit of his posterity if not for himself, to restore the equilibrium that has been so unwittingly destroyed. Some enthusiasts have even urged the profitableness of tree-planting as a crop, seeking to demonstrate that the growth would yield a good rate of interest, and that profits can be taken in a very few years. Nor has this matter been regarded as concerning solely, or even mainly, the older sections of the country, but rather as having a special bearing upon those regions of the West where the large supply of particular kinds of wood have brought them into common consumption, and where vast prairie regions are treeless and the teeming inhabitants and their property are at the mercy of storms and winds that gather fury in their long sweep, unbroken and untempered by forests.

All this is very well, no doubt, and prizes, as proposed, may well be offered for tree-planting in this country, as in England and on the Continent. But there has suddenly come to the front a new phase of the subject, brought conspicuously to light by the late census report on the lumber industry of the country. This report was made by Professor Sargent, a gentleman eminently fitted for the task, and it reveals the startling fact that the destruction of our forests, in the prosecution of the lumber industry, is proceeding at so rapid a rate that we are on the verge of an exhaustion of the supply. This commercial aspect of the situation is of paramount interest to the country, and demands a prompt and candid consideration on the part of the people and of Congress. The extent of the tree slaughter may be seen in the following items of sawed products as returned in the census of 1880 :

Feet of lumber.....	18,091,356,000
Number of laths.....	1,761,788,000
Number of shingles.....	5,555,046,000
Number of staves.....	1,248,226,000

Number of sets headings.....	146,523,000
Feet of bobbin and spool.....	34,676,000
Value of products.....	\$233,367,729

But, besides these items, there are great quantities of trees brought down for other purposes than for sawing. Professor Sargent says that in a few years the entire present stock will be gone. This is especially the case with the supply of white pine. The total quantity of this timber standing is put at not above 80,000,000,000 feet, and the annual cutting of it at about 10,000,000,000 feet; at which rate, before another census year rolls around the supply will be exhausted. A genuine alarm has been sounded for some months. The President, in his late message, referred to it, and advised legislation for the protection of our forests. It is certainly incumbent upon Congress to discourage this wholesale and reckless destruction of an article of prime necessity. We have to the north of us, in the British Dominion, a storehouse of pine timber, perpetual by its situation beyond the encroachments of agriculture, to which we should be looking for relief. We have gone far enough in the direction of consuming our own supply at anything like the present rate, and should begin at once to draw more freely upon other sources.

But, in the face of these facts, the late Tariff Commission further encourage and stimulate the present rate of our timber waste by continuing the tariff on the importation of lumber. This would incite not only the lumber dealers to increase production, but every farmer having a marketable tree, to cut it down. On the other hand, the dealers are numerous and wealthy. The number of sawing establishments in 1880 was 25,708, and their capital \$181,186,123. They have been alive to the situation that has been revealed, but in a direction opposed to the welfare of the country. They have sought to disparage the census report and have been shrewd enough to capture the Tariff Commission. It is ordinary human nature on the part of the dealers to do this, though short-sighted; but it is humiliating weakness on the part of the Commission to make such an exhibition of its ignorance. What the country really needs is to have the duties on foreign timber abolished altogether. It is another one of those blunders on the part of protectionists that are rapidly arousing the people to demand of their legislators to dissociate taxation from protection. Let us have a tariff that will protect the people—the country at large—as against special interests. If the present tinkering does not do this, they should be thrown aside until real representatives of the

ary 13.)

n the subject
ons the pub-
gality in our
from consid-
induced by
ealth and to
sought to
rees, and to
imself, to re-
oyed. Some
anting as a
a good rate
years. Nor
even mainly,
special bear-
ply of par-
consumption,
g inhabitants
that gather
orests.

may well be
and on the
new phase of
census report
as made by
task, and it
orests, in the
rapid a rate
This com-
the country,
part of the
lter may be
turned in the

18,091,356,000
1,761,788,000
5,555,046,000
1,248,226,000

people are intrusted with legislation. At any rate, let us have the legislative protection to our forest supplies that the President lately advised ; and beyond this it is highly important that the public should be brought to understand the advisability of using other materials than timber, such as coal for wood, wire for fences, and stone, brick and concrete for houses, as well as planting trees for health, use and beauty.

(Daily Gazette and Free Press, Elmira, January 15, 1883.)

THE DUTY ON LUMBER.

If there is any one article which should be admitted into our ports free of duty and the import of which should be in every way encouraged, that article is timber. It is the height of folly to tax it. The duties collected in this way are insignificant in amount, and every dollar thus collected is taken, over and over again, from the consumer of domestic lumber for the sole benefit of the manufacturers. These have not the excuse of a weak and undeveloped industry, which must be built up at the expense of the consumer for the general good of the country. These manufacturers of lumber are rich, prosperous and strong. Their methods and facilities for carrying on their business are unsurpassed. No possible competition can deprive them of their immense profits. If there exists in the United States a single industry which is in the position to flourish without protection, it is the lumber industry.

If from no other, from purely economic grounds, this should be removed ; not reduced but absolutely, completely removed. It has served to build up dangerous monopolies and represses the prosperity of the country. There is a wide interest in this matter manifested in this country, not only from the feeling that the duties at present existing tend to the building up and continuance of monopolies, but from the fact that public attention is at present specially directed toward the preservation of our forests.

As a first step toward their preservation it is evident that the duty on Canadian lumber ought to be removed. We impose a tax of two dollars per thousand feet on lumber entering the United States from Canada, and this duty, of course, instead of protecting the forests, serves as a bounty for their rapid destruction. It takes two dollars out of the pocket of every man who buys a thousand feet of lumber and hands it over to the lumber manufacturers of Chicago and the

us have the
sident lately
public should
er materials
stone, brick
alth, use and

northwest, whom and whom alone it protects. This duty is a daily, deadly drain on the resources of the country. It touches every man who builds a wooden house, barn or fence, or who pays rent to the builder. It attacks every industry which uses wood in any way. We pay more for our furniture, for our floors, even for our daily kindling wood, because of this duty, and in addition to this perpetual tax we are destroying our own forests, robbing our children and doing incalculable injury to the climatic future of the country.

, 1883.)

our ports free
encouraged,

The duties
y dollar thus
r of domestic
have not the
be built up at
the country.
strong. Their
unsurpassed.
se profits. If
is in the posi-
try.

is should be
oved. It has
he prosperity
manifested in
at present ex-
plies, but from
ected toward

that the duty
a tax of two
d States from
g the forests,
es two dollars
et of lumber
cago and the

The forest question is becoming one of the popular questions of the day and everything which relates to the extent and condition of our forests is eagerly read and discussed. It requires no great knowledge of the subject to understand that if Canadian lumber is excluded from this country by reason of a tax on its importation, the drain upon our forests must be much greater than if foreign timber was allowed to compete on equal terms with the products of our own forests. The people understand this. They know that the removal of the forests will be followed by severe climatic changes; that the rivers of the country will often be changed to torrents or reduced to streamlets; that springs and streams will disappear; that agriculture will perish and manufactures dwindle and languish. They see these evils hastened by the retention of this protective duty and see no earthly reason why it should be retained. The public mischief that this tax is doing is so potent and so serious that its early abolition is imperatively demanded.

(Boston Daily Advertiser, Jan. 16th, 1883.)

THE LUMBER TARIFF.

Neither in the senate nor in the house tariff bill is any change made in the wood schedule, which was also left unchanged by the Tariff Commission. It would be interesting to learn by what process of reasoning the members of the Tariff Commission and two committees of Congress have persuaded themselves that the United States should continue to impose a duty on lumber. The question may be looked at from various points of view, but we can discover no way in which, from any point of view, the tariff can be logically defended. It is certainly not because we need the revenue that the duty should be retained, and that part of the case may be dismissed at once. It is equally certain that the reason cannot be that the consumers of lum-

ber desire that a tax be laid upon a part or whole of the lumber they use. How is the duty to be defended as a measure of protection? The object of protection is not to confer a benefit upon the producers of the articles protected, but to benefit the whole country. Unless a protective duty either helps to develop an industry which it is important for the whole country shall be developed, or helps to maintain the existence of industries which the good of the country requires shall be maintained, there is no good defense of the duty. How stands the case with lumber? Under the present tariff the whole burden of the home demand for lumber is thrown upon the home forests. Less than six per cent. of the pine and spruce manufactured in the United States in the course of a year is imported from Canada, which is our only foreign source of supply. But we use about eleven thousand million feet of these kinds of wood every year, and according to the last census there is left standing not more than eighty thousand million feet of white pine in the whole country.

The protective system, as applied to sugar, is not justifiable, because it is impossible that with the utmost possible protection the production can be so stimulated as to give us a good supply from home sources. It was because the farms of Great Britain were incapable of producing enough wheat to feed the people of the British Isles that the corn laws became indefensible, and the repeal of them was wise and necessary. It is the same with sugar in this country; and it is even more strongly the same with respect to lumber. Instead of increasing under the stimulus of the tariff, our forests are disappearing so rapidly that in a very few years there will be nothing left to protect. Wood is a prime necessity, and will always be so. Notwithstanding the use of stone and brick in building, and the abundance of coal for fuel in England, enormous quantities of wood are imported into that country annually. It must always be the same with us, after our forests have been exhausted. Meantime, we are not diminishing the consumption of lumber by the tariff, nor are we inducing anybody to cultivate forests for timber, but we are enabling the owners of woodlands to obtain a high price for their lumber. In short, the protective tariff benefits nobody but these lumber kings.

Finally, the abrogation of the duty is called for by the necessity we are under of protecting our forests in order to protect ourselves. Instead of destroying our own forests we can destroy those of Canada. And it must not be forgotten that the protection of forests means something more than keeping up a supply of lumber. The production

lumber they
protection?
e producers
Unless a
it is im-
to maintain
y requires
uty. How
whole bur-
me forests.
ured in the
ada, which
even thou-
according to
y thousand

of lumber is by no means the most important function of the forests; the part they play in moderating climate, in protecting the surface of the ground, and in regulating the flow of streams, and in preserving springs, is now well understood by scientific men, and we cannot safely continue the rate of forest destruction which is now going on in every part of the country without serious danger to our future prosperity. As a step, then, towards checking the destruction of our forests, for the removal of this duty can only delay for a few years the final extinction of the white pine forests of the North, we urge upon Congress the necessity of placing lumber and forest products of all sorts, entering the United States, upon the free list. If there is any place for protection in this schedule it is upon furniture, woodenware and other manufactures which require something more than a saw-mill for their production.

(Springfield Republican, Jan. 16th, 1883.)

THE LUMBER TARIFF.

ifiable, be-
tion the pro-
ood supply
ritain were
the British
al of them
s country;
r. Instead
e disappear-
ing left to

Apparently neither the Senate Finance Committee nor the Ways and Means Committee of the House proposes to qualify the duty on lumber which the Tariff Commission left as it was at \$2 per M. If we had an unlimited supply of lumber so that we could draw upon our own resources without fear of exhaustion, or if timber growing had become so well naturalized as to insure an unfailing supply by a new growth, there might be some excuse for this imposition. As it is, it simply shuts out the Canadian supply and puts a bounty on the sweeping off of our own forests. It does not "protect" the forests but destroys them, enriching the lumber millers, but impoverishing the people and inducing climatic changes and results of the greatest gravity.

Notwith-
undance of
are import-
e with us,
not dimin
e inducing
g the own-

The census bureau investigation was able to find only 85,000,000 M of white pine lumber standing in the United States, which at the outside would represent ten years' supply, at the present rate of cutting. The Canadian supply is estimated at less, but probably approaches in amount the American. The Canadian competition with our own forests is in white pine and spruce,—two of the most serviceable and widely used woods in all the commoner uses to which lumber is put. The Southern supply is largely of hard pine, and the American broad-leaved hard woods can be grown much more readily than a good quality of pine.

In short,
s.
e necessity
t ourselves.
of Canada.
ests means
production

Prof. C. S. Sargent who had charge of the forestry statistics, found standing May 31, 1880, 475,000 M of white pine in Maine, 5,000,000 M of spruce. During the year ending at that date there was cut in the same State 138,825 M feet of pine and 301,000 M feet of spruce. But in Maine more attention is paid than elsewhere to the selection of old trees for market and the growth of young ones, allowing the forests to be profitably worked at stated periods of from fifteen to twenty-five years. In New Hampshire and Vermont the white pine is exhausted, and the spruce standing in 1880 was estimated at 1,510,000 and 755,000 M, respectively. But the destruction by one company alone in Essex county, Vermont, the present winter will be 80,000 M.

We believe that forestry growing is destined to be a profitable interest in this country, but our people do not take readily to investments which make slow returns. In the interval it does not seem wise to aggregate the threatened destitution by excluding the Canadian pine and spruce. Everything which enters into the construction of dwellings affects the people most directly. Besides, as Prof. Sargent showed in some of his recent talks to farmers, there are numerous industries in wooden ware of great aggregate magnitude, which depend upon a steady and reliable supply of a stock at reasonable rates. Take off the duties and spare our own forests, for the present at least.

(*The World, New York, January 21, 1883.*)

THE LUMBER SWINDLE IN CONGRESS.

Mr. * * * the independent and public-spirited Senator from Nebraska, yesterday made an emphatic protest against one particularly outrageous swindle of the tariff. He moved to strike out the whole list of duties on wood and woodenware and let all these things in duty free. This was a patriotic proposition, and was naturally opposed by * * who represents the men who are anxious to clear out what is left of the forests of Michigan, and * * who represents the men who are anxious to clear out what is left of the forests of Maine. These greedy creatures in asking for a duty on timber or its products are simply asking for a bounty to be given them for making away with the patrimony of the country. The fact is that there is now only eight years' supply of white pine left in the country. In round numbers, half the supply in the markets of the Eastern States comes from

Canada and half from the lower peninsula of Michigan. In the latter there were in 1880 estimated to be twenty-nine thousand millions of feet remaining, and since then nine thousand millions of feet have been cut and marketed, leaving at this rate between four and five years' supply still available. It is this supply which we ought to take some measures for preserving and protecting that * * * and his clients insist we shall clear out as fast as possible. A pine tree is not marketable until it is fifty years of age, and at that age only begins to make clear lumber. The clear lumber, which ten years ago formed 13 per cent. of the whole supply from Michigan, now forms only 3 per cent. of the whole. This lumber comes from trees between the ages of seventy-five and a hundred and twenty-five years; and the diminution from more than one-ninth to less than one-thirtieth of the whole supply contributed by such trees means that virtually all of them that are accessible have already been cut. How their replacement is to be secured is the problem that ought to agitate statesmen. The problem that does agitate statesmen of the school of * * * and of * * * is how can the rest of the forest be most speedily and effectually cleared, and a bounty for clearing them, in the form of a duty upon the competing product of Canada, is the device formed by these statesmen for that end. We have seen that the supply of the lower peninsula of Michigan will be exhausted, at the present rate of cutting, in less than five years. The pine forests of Maine, at the present rate of cutting, will disappear in seven years. Mr. * * * of Michigan, and Mr. * * * of Maine, think it better that their lumbering constituents should have large profits and quick returns than that the next generation should have any timber to cut. But there is no reason why other Senators should not deem it more important that the forests should be preserved than that * * * and * * * should continue to adorn the Senate by dint of grinding the axes of their timber-cutting constituents.

(The Sun, New York, January 23d, 1883.)

LUMBER.

We observe with regret that some of the representatives of Michigan are much excited at the proposal to admit Canadian lumber free of duty, by way of preserving a little longer the pine forests of that State, as well as those of our Northern country.

The speedy destruction of the forests of Michigan will prove a ca-

larity of which its present members of Congress appear to have no adequate conception. These forests can never be reproduced, and it is the part of wisdom to preserve them. By judiciously and gradually thinning them out, they may be made to last for ages, and yet furnish as much lumber as is necessary for the use of the people. On the other hand, by destroying them at once a few lumber speculators may get rich, but the State will be permanently impoverished.

This is not a question of protection or free trade. It involves no controversy respecting the development among us of any branch of useful industry. Why, then, should we hasten the destruction of our forests? Why should we promote such a disaster, when the Canadian woods are ready to be drawn upon? Do our legislators think it their duty to take better care of Canada than they take of their own country?

All lumber should be admitted free of duty. Even protectionists should vote for this measure, because it tends to protect the interests of our own country.

(The Star, New York, January, 1883.)

LET LUMBER BE FREE.

Were it known that the whole supply of iron and anthracite coal remaining in the mines of the United States would be exhausted in less than a dozen years at the present rate of production, no one would for a moment dream of excluding iron and coal by a protective tariff. Any step which could be taken to postpone such calamities as would follow the exhaustion of these articles of prime necessity would be eagerly taken. Pine and spruce lumber are also articles of prime necessity; and we know that at the present rate of consumption the spruce and white pine lumber remaining in the United States must disappear in something less than a dozen years, unless the present rate of consumption can be checked. But the forests of Canada still contain large quantities of this lumber, and by admitting the Canadian lumber to free competition in our markets, our own forests would be protected and their devastation checked. Every builder in the country is anxious for the remission of this duty. The lumbermen of Maine and the Northwest, who have secured vast tracts of timber lands, oppose it. The Tariff Commission, captured by the lumbermen at Chicago, recommended the retention of the duty. The Committee of

Ways and Means of the House, and the Finance Committee of the Senate, in response to the urgent demands of the representatives of Maine and the Northwestern lumber States in Congress, approve the recommendation of the committee. Senator * * * declared that the lumber of Maine should be protected as well as the iron of Pennsylvania and the sugar of Louisiana ; but in spite of his energetic protestations, the Senate voted to put lumber on the free list, which has brought a powerful lobby interest to Washington to prevent the passage of the bill. And there is too much reason for believing that the lumber monopoly will carry its point in the House or in the Conference Committee before the measure is whipped into shape for final action. Free lumber would tend directly to save the forests of the country, which, once destroyed, cannot be easily restored, if restored at all. The interests of all classes, save the lumber speculators, require that this article should be free.

(*The Metropolitan Industrial League.*)

WOOD.

The principle and policy of the League is "true protection and justice to all American Industries," based upon our true conditions and possibility of future developments and say respecting lumber :

It appears so unnatural that we should consume ourselves first and then depend on the chance generosity of others that the free admission of timber is recommended. Canada will doubtless protect herself.

(*Southern Lumberman, Nashville, Jan. 1st, 1883.*)

TIMBER TARIFF ABSURDITY.

The report of the Tariff Commission naturally excites a great deal of attention, and the fact that it is the object of high commendation on the part of protection journals, as naturally subjects it to a good deal of suspicion. It certainly, in the words of the *New York Post*, although more enlightened than it was generally expected to be, contains some very glaring absurdities. An instance of absurdity appears with respect to the timber duties, recommending that they should be retained. The absurdity of this is apparent, when we remember that with great cause we are complaining of the demolition of our forests, and our government offers bounties to induce persons to plant trees upon public lands. To offer a premium to extend our stock of growing timber, and then give an inducement of twenty per cent. to cut it down, is one of the most complete absurdities that can be pointed out.

(*Rome Daily Sentinel*, Jan. 8, 1883.)

THE FORESTS AND THE TARIFF.

By recommending the retention of the duty upon lumber entering the United States, the Committee of Ways and Means has aimed a blow at forest protection that generally finds no favor among the people who have given the subject due attention.

As a matter of course it is folly to tax foreign lumber as far as the national treasury is concerned. The duties which are collected by the government in this way are very small. Neither can the lumber industry be said to need the protection. It is one of those industries which have long since passed their infancy and have reached a vigorous manhood. It has outlived the necessity of protection supposing it ever needed it. The manufacturers of lumber are powerful, even to the extent of forming a monopoly, and they have grown rich from the prices which taxation of foreign lumber has enabled them to charge the consumer of domestic lumber.

But it is clear that the permission to buy Canadian lumber free from tariff restrictions and demands, will cause a decreased drain upon the forests of our own country. What the trees of America need is a chance to grow and multiply. It is well understood that the destruction of the forests means severe climatic changes, that the effect upon rivers and streams will be such as to work incalculable injury to the agriculture, manufactures and commerce of the country. These evils are hurried on by the retention of the protective duty, which virtually tells the people that they must cut down their own trees first before they can hope to go into a foreign market to buy their wood without any tariff charges to pay. Meantime the prosperity of the country is threatened that a little company of men who are already rich, may add something more to their hoards.

This Tariff sharpens every woodman's axe. It encourages prospective wreck and ruin.

(*The Chicago Tribune*, February 3, 1883.)

THE LUMBER BARONS' PETITION.

Four respectable and worthy gentlemen in this city—large owners of Michigan pine-lands—have issued an address to all persons engaged in the lumber trade to obtain signatures as rapidly as possible to a petition which they have prepared, and which they forward with the address. This petition is addressed to Congress, and we reproduce it that the public generally may see how in an emergency even such re-

spectable gentlemen will resort to statements so utterly incomprehensible that they would, if uttered by others, be classed as exaggerations unbecoming churchmen of their own high standing. The petition represents that the signers do :

Most respectfully remonstrate against the proposition now before your honorable bodies, and adopted in the Senate of the United States, looking to the admission of the manufactured lumber of the Province of Canada to the markets of the United States free from duty, to ruinously compete with a traffic giving employment to fully one million laborers and involving capital of not less than \$300,000,000 in its prosecution. Urging that the admission of Canadian lumber free from duty would be but adding the present rate of the duty to value of Canadian standing timber, opening up a competition injurious to American manufacturers, while not decreasing the cost of building material to the millions who form the consuming classes. Urging, further, that so long as the Canadian Government retains the tax upon lumber imported into Canada, it is manifestly unjust to admit Canadian lumber free, while the American product, now largely in demand in Winnipeg and some other portions of the Dominion of Canada, is burdened with a tax, thus effectually giving to the Canadian product the control of the markets of this country by the admission of their lumber product free in the Eastern States, whither it is most largely imported; and as well control of the Western markets through their ability to exclude the American product, except upon payment of duties, from Winnipeg, to which their own lumber may be sent without duty.

The statements of this petition are most remarkable. It asserts that the "manufactured" lumber of Canada is to be admitted without tax, and by manufactured lumber is intended the rough product of the saw mill.

This lumber is intended for the use of Western farmers for fencing, for outhouses, barns, and sheds, for all rough building purposes, for repairs and sidewalks, and countless purposes for which rough pine lumber can be employed. To admit this lumber for consumers free of tax, it is declared, will be "ruinously" to compete with American lumber. For whom is this government established? Do the handful of capitalists who own the remnants of the pine forests consume this lumber? Do they pay the tax which is collected from it? Do they produce the pine forests which they hold possession of and which for purposes of insatiable greed they are rapidly destroying? The persons who are demanding and exacting this tax on the people of Illinois, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska have neither produced the forests nor are they consumers. They are nothing more than toll-gatherers standing at the gates and taking in a tax from the millions of consumers in the treeless States to whom lumber is an article of prime necessity, but who are overcharged by these speculators in stumpage and logs. They have the hardihood to say that this tax is levied for the benefit of the "traffic." That is to say, not for the axemen or the

farmers who buy the stuff, but for the men who "traffic"—that is, do what they can to get the advantage of each other.

Mr. Carpenter and the other gentlemen who traffic in lumber make the monstrous assertion that the lumber business which needs "protection" gives employment to "fully 1,000,000 laborers." Even for gentlemen who "swap" fish yarns this figure is a large one. The census reports show that in 1880 the whole number of persons engaged in the United States in the lumber business was 156,178 males, 433 females, and 5,971 children! That is a pretty large fraction short, even in lumber measure, of "fully 1,000,000 laborers." Throwing in the women and children, the whole is considerably short of a million!

But these gentlemen speak only for a portion of the three States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota,* and the census gives the whole number of men engaged in felling, sawing, and planing lumber not only in these three States, but in all the other thirty-five States and the Territories; and not only of the pine lumber of these three States, but of all the various kinds of lumber in all the States of the Union.

Moreover, the census returns show that the whole number of males of 16 years and over engaged in all the industrial mechanical employments of the United States was 2,025,506. Mr. Van Schaick and the other gentlemen send forth under their certification the statement that "fully 1,000,000 of laborers" are employed in lumber-making—that is, one-half the American males over 16 years of age working for wages in the whole United States at industrial occupations are engaged in the lumber trade, and this, too, without including the women and children. Messrs. Carpenter and Van Schaick send the petition containing this marvelous statement to their customers, with an appeal that it be signed and sent to Senator * * * "and it may not yet be too late" to save the million of laborers who are threatened with "ruin!"

* The census returns for 1880 of the Lumbering Industry give total average number of hands employed, including women and children, in Michigan, 24,333; in Wisconsin, 8,465; in Minnesota, 2,854; making in all 35,552. These gentlemen, of course, meant when talking of millions, those that have to pay them the extra \$2 per M. on lumber the duty imposes. But, however many may be employed producing lumber, does any sane man fancy there would be one man less employed in this country were the duty removed. The only effect the removal of the duty would have would be to allow Canadian lumber to compete with them, and possibly reduce somewhat the enormous profits of a few lumbermen and land speculators. Take for instance the two establishments with which these two gentlemen are connected, which sawed in 1882 nearly 120,000,000 feet, or about one quarter of the annual import of this lumber from Canada—the duty on this at \$2 would be \$240,000. The difference of the competition might be to reduce their yearly revenue from about \$8 per M, or \$860,000, to \$6 per M, or \$720,000. Still with this amount coming in yearly there would be but slight danger of their going to the Poor House, and it might be some little relief to the poor people who are now compelled to pay them about any price they choose to ask.

A somewhat noted Senator once remarked, that about the only thing meaner than \$500,000 was \$1,000,000. One would be led, from the action of these gentlemen, to believe that the only thing meaner than a poor lumberman was a rich one.

The petition does not mention what proportion of the lumber cutters in Michigan and other States are Canadians brought to this country to compete at low wages with the rest of the million to tax the farmers of the treeless States.

The petition asks intelligent persons, even lumber dealers, to certify to Congress that to remove the tax from lumber would be to add that much to the value of Canadian lumber. If the repeal of the tax on lumber will not admit Canadian lumber cheaper than our lumber where, when, and how is the "ruin" to take place?

The Canadian Government will not admit Michigan lumber into Winnipeg free of tax, and the reason is, that Canadian lumber is taxed in this country and has been for years. Their tax is in retaliation for ours. The repeal of the American tax will, of course, be followed by the repeal of the tax collected at Winnipeg.

This petition is a most ludicrous exhibition of the rage of the "fully 1,000,000 of American laborers" at the prospect of a repeal of a tax under which the consumers of American lumber have seen the price of lumber rise from \$4 to \$6 per thousand feet during the last four years. We reproduce the Chicago prices of lumber since 1878:

	Nov. 15, 1878.	Nov. 9, 1882.	Adv. p. c.
A stock boards.....	\$24 00	\$30 00	25
Fencing, No. 1.....	10 00	16 00	66
Fencing, No. 2.....	9 00	13 00	44
Common boards.....	10 50@11 00	15 00@18 00	50@63
Dimension stuff, 20 to 30 feet long.	10 60@16 00	16 50@23 00	65@43
Pickets, rough.....	7 00	12 00	72
Shingles, standard.....	2 25	2 90	28
Lath.....	1 50	2 75	83

Now, suppose the effect of the repeal of the bounty the Illinois farmers pay to Messrs. Carpenter, Van Schaick, *et al.*, should happily be to reduce the present excessively high price of lumber to the people of the prairie States by \$2 per 1,000 feet, would it not be a public blessing to millions of toilers, and would it not still leave a big price and a large profit for the speculator in pine lands?

The Albany prices for the three upper qualities show the following changes in three years:

	September, 1879.	September, 1882.	Adv. p. c.
Clear.....	\$40 to \$42	\$62 to \$64	56
Fourths.....	35 to 37	57 to 59	61
Selects.....	30 to 32	52 to 54	71

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

ACCOMPANYING PAMPHLET ON FOREST PROTECTION.

The compiler of this Pamphlet has been advised of excellent articles having appeared in other papers, but those inserted therein, were all that came under his own observation, or of which he could immediately obtain copies. He had also in his possession, most valuable articles written by gentlemen who have devoted time and labor, in calling the attention of the public, to this, the most important economic question of the day—one, before which all others sink into insignificance in comparison ; for nothing can be more true, than the remarks of "The Glasgow (Scotland) Herald" when reviewing an article on the subject in 1876, which says : "The knowledge we have gained of a dearth of cotton may help us to appreciate 'the terribleness of the calamity that would be experienced from a dearth of timber' in Canada and the States. In point of fact, both Canada and the States are busy sawing from under them the high-reaching, fortune-making branch, on which, like conquerors, they are now sitting and overlooking the world."

When we consider the importance that an abundance of the most valuable timber has had on the past welfare of the country, and come to realize what "a dearth of timber" means, all will readily see that the foregoing is by no means an overdrawn statement. If we also consider the fact, that every human being in this country, must have timber in some form or another for his protection or comfort—that our shelter is of timber, the floors we walk on, the chairs we sit on, the tables we eat from, the conveyances we use ; even our cradles and coffins are of wood ; we can readily see that in one form or another we must have timber.

The great ingenuity of "the everlasting Yankee" has not even yet touched the subject. Notwithstanding the fences of wire, the use of iron in building, the terra cotta and straw-lumber, still the

ROYAL SOCIETY
CANADA

consumption of our old friend wooden lumber increased nearly fifty per cent. in the ten years from 1870 to 1880, the former being 12,755,543,000, and the latter 18,091,356,000 feet, and though it has always been claimed that iron and lumber keep together, cheap lumber accompanying cheap iron, we now find iron so low that producers claim they are at the lowest rung of the ladder, while lumber has advanced in three years fully 50 per cent., with every prospect of still further increase; and yet we, in the north, are informed that we are within eight years of the time when our supplies of white pine and spruce, which are our great stock of this indispensable material, must cease; and this is not the statement of interested parties, which might be open to suspicion, but of those specially employed by the government of the country to ascertain the true condition of the forests.

It will no doubt be said, "what of this, there are still vast forests in the south to be drawn upon?" This may be a matter of great value to the south, but to the people of the north, who now make and use five-sixths of the sawed lumber produced, it is a matter of the most serious importance. The value of the lumber now produced in the north exceeds \$200,000,000 a year as it falls from the saw—that it is all wanted there can be no better evidence than the fact that demand and price are both increasing—and to replace it would cost from two to three times this sum, even if the same lumber could be obtained elsewhere, which cannot be; and \$500,000,000 a year would not replace it; so that in a very short time this northern country, instead of having a great and profitable industry, advancing and helping every interest, will be called upon to pay out hundreds of millions of dollars annually for such material.

But even our southern friends are interested with us in the preservation of this timber, as the uses to which it is applied are so different from theirs, that large quantities are annually sent south, and the government of Canada, recognizing this fact, while imposing a retaliatory duty on the white pine admits southern pine, duty free. It is further to be hoped that southern governments may learn a lesson from the prodigality of the north, and preserve their most valuable timber for the benefit and wellfare of the community, instead of giving it away to timber land speculators, or to such an ignorant race of destructionists, as have gobbled up the timber of the north, or they too will soon be dispossessed of one of the greatest blessings that Providence has vouchsafed their country.

When people talk, as they sometimes do, of the inexhaustable forests of the south, they little know the sawing capacity of the northern mills, which could in twelve months time convert the whole merchantable pine of the state of Georgia into lumber, and be but six months in using up the pine of Florida; and the men that run these mills, not only have the will but the greed to do it.

When one considers the many industries engaged in the various processes involved in the use of this material and the hundreds of thousands of laborers directly depending thereupon for their livelihood—and that it is an article required by every individual of the whole community, one can readily see that every means should be adopted for its preservation and protection.

While England that has cheap coal, cheap iron and cheap labor, and that can get her supplies at the cheapest rates from the north of Europe, annually expends nearly \$100,000,000 for timber, one can readily recognize how much it would cost this country (that is yet to be built up) to import its lumber from any foreign source. It has been estimated that it would take the entire sailing tonnage of the world to convey the amount of timber annually consumed in this country from any foreign lumber port. But where to get it at any price in the enormous quantities used in this country is a question that would puzzle those best informed on the subject to determine.

From the foregoing we recognize the truth of the statement made by a writer in the accompanying pages, wherein he says: "NO MORE VITAL QUESTION CAN COME BEFORE CONGRESS. PERHAPS NO CONGRESS HAS EVER BEEN CALLED ON TO DECIDE AN ECONOMIC QUESTION OF GREATER MOMENT."